

February 1, 2010



FFY 2008

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT (IDEA PART B)

July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009



Table of Contents

LEGEND.....	3
OVERVIEW OF THE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT DEVELOPMENT	4
SUMMARY OF PROGRESS TOWARD MAINE’S STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN	10
MONITORING PRIORITY: FAPE IN THE LRE	11
INDICATOR 1.....	11
INDICATOR 2.....	15
INDICATOR 3.....	17
INDICATOR 4.....	24
INDICATOR 5.....	28
INDICATOR 6.....	30
INDICATOR 7.....	31
INDICATOR 8.....	44
MONITORING PRIORITY: DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION	46
INDICATOR 9.....	46
INDICATOR 10.....	48
MONITORING PRIORITY: EFFECTIVE GENERAL SUPERVISION PART B / CHILD FIND.....	50
INDICATOR 11.....	50
MONITORING PRIORITY: EFFECTIVE GENERAL SUPERVISION PART B / EFFECTIVE TRANSITION	54
INDICATOR 12.....	54
INDICATOR 13.....	57
INDICATOR 14.....	58
MONITORING PRIORITY: EFFECTIVE GENERAL SUPERVISION PART B / GENERAL SUPERVISION.....	60
INDICATOR 15.....	60
INDICATOR 16.....	68
INDICATOR 17.....	70
INDICATOR 18.....	72
INDICATOR 19.....	74
INDICATOR 20.....	76

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

The APR that follows presents the indicator performance in a consistent design that will enable the reader to follow the discussion and quickly determine specific details of the report. The indicators are presented on the OSEP defined template design for the APR for most indicators. As required for FFY2008, indicator 7 is presented on the SPP template and includes baseline data and targets for the remainder of the SPP. In order to highlight key aspects of the report, color and font selections were used for specific data and passages. The chart below provides a legend for the formats used throughout the document.

Legend

Measurable and Rigorous Target data are presented in each indicator in this style (Arial, 10 pt, blue, italic)

Actual performance/compliance data for FFY 2007 are presented in each indicator in this font style (Arial, 10 pt, brown)

OSEP's Response Letter and Table, received June 1, 2009, requested a specific response in Maine's February 1, 2010 APR for certain indicators. The text from the response table has been copied from the letter as an image and inserted in a border (as surrounds this text).

Maine's response immediately follows the inserted text.

Indicator 7 is reported on the SPP template. The narrative of the indicator is formatted in the same text styles as were used in the APR but in a single color (purple) to differentiate it from the APR template. Data elements are formatted as indicated above.

Several indicators update SPP Improvement Activities. Those changes are described in the **"Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2008:"** section of the indicator narrative and have been edited into the SPP. The APR and the updated SPP will be posted on the Maine Department of Education website located at URL <http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/spp/index.html> by February 12, 2010.

Note: The word "district" has been replaced with the acronym "LEA" (for Local Educational Agency) to be consistent with the definitions in Maine law.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

This Annual Performance Report (APR) is the fourth report of the progress toward the Measureable and Rigorous targets established in the State Performance Plan (SPP) on December 2, 2005. This APR reports improvement in a number of key indicators of the plan resulting from efforts in multiple program and support areas in the State of Maine.

Stakeholder group activities

Maine Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (MACECD) is the stakeholder group providing guidance and support to the Maine Department of Education in implementing the State Performance Plan (SPP). As a group of dedicated volunteers with the best interests of children with disabilities age birth through 20 in mind, MACECD started its year with a two-day planning meeting. MACECD began its work on the Annual Performance Report (APR) and the SPP. They were asked by the Maine Department of Education to look at the documents with a critical eye and assess what needed to be addressed in order to ensure accurate and adequate service delivery to the students receiving Special Education Services in the State of Maine.

An early task in MACECD's two-day planning meeting was the formation of four committees to concentrate on specific sub-sets of the indicators for the year: Due Process and Quality Assurance Monitoring (B-15 through B-20, C-9 through C-14) ; Early Transition (C-2 through C-8, B-6 and B-12); Student Performance (B-1 through B-7, B-14); and Evaluation, Services and Treatment (C-1, C-7, B-8 through B-10). MACECD's monthly agenda includes items for the MACECD membership as well as committee breakout sessions. The committees assess data and make advisory recommendations to the Commissioner of Education on unmet needs from the committees' respective subject areas. The recommendations are addressed and integrated into the operational execution of the Department (program review, dispute resolution, funding, technical assistance, professional development, and discretionary programs) to improve support to special education students statewide.

Improvement Activities in the Preschool System

Child Development Services has undergone significant structural, fiscal, and human resource changes as a result of legislative action in each year since 2006. A structural analysis of the changes was included in the APR submitted for FFY2006. This structure has been retained relatively unchanged for the past year which has supported stability in the system for the first time in 4 years. Stability, however, in no way intimates status quo for this system. The system has faced a number of challenges during the past year and has emerged as an entity with growing resiliency. During FFY2008 CDS was involved in the following initiatives:

- The centralization of the fiscal process for the system received a clean audit for all regional sites and for the CDS State IEU (Child Development Services State Intermediate Educational Unit).
- The Case-e data system has undergone continuing improvements which support our ongoing oversight of the interrelationship of the fiscal, data, and monitoring systems and supports data gathering for the APR.

- The CDS website has continued to change and serves as an emerging representation of the intricacies of our system.
- The web based system for the applications for local entitlement plans is revised annually to reflect statutory and organizational changes as well as SPP/APR requirements.
- The Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development Calendar of Events is maintained and available on the website. Letters of Findings and Corrective Action Plans are available on the website.
- A training committee comprised of regional representatives and CDS State IEU personnel oversees the professional development needs of the system and serves as an oversight committee for the expenditure of Part C ARRA funds.
- Collaborations with other state agencies were supported by the CDS State IEU to heighten our visibility as an early intervention entity within the greater State of Maine system of services to children birth to five.
- The State Level Advisory Board continues to meet monthly regarding the interface between regional site activities and the general supervision requirements of the CDS State IEU.
- A team completed work on a revision of our state mandated IFSP form and accompanying guidance materials.
- The Birth to Five General Supervision System Team (GSST) expanded to work with a birth to 20 GSST team. This group utilized the Part C and Part B Critical Elements Analysis Guide (CrEAG) to review our system plan.
- Year 2 site monitoring was completed for all sites with a completion date of June 30, 2009.
- Administrative and Informational Letters were developed to provide policy direction.
- Three sites reorganized to become two as of July 1, 2009 reducing the number of sites to 15 for FFY2009.
- Continuation of CDS State IEU team oversight of APR process.

With technical assistance from NERRC, CDS State IEU staff developed a General Supervision System (GSST) http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/cds/supervision/gsst_109.ppt that references the general supervision system “The Big 8” developed by OSEP. The CDS State IEU shared this system with the CDS State Level Advisory Board on a monthly basis since September 2008 through presentations by the CDS State Director, the Assistant Attorney General for Education and Larry Ringer from OSEP. Additionally, the CDS State Director presented to the Maine Advisory Council (MACECD), all site directors, and staff representatives who attended the Child Outcomes Summary Form Training Session. Informational Letter Number 2 was sent January 9, 2009 with the PowerPoint as a hyperlink (<http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/cds/infoltrs/ltr2profiles.pdf>). Additional information is provided at CDS State IEU weekly Lunch and Learn sessions hosted by the Assistant Attorney General for Education.

The CDS State IEU has worked closely with the school-aged system to ensure there is consistency in determination responses. The CDS State IEU has monitored each of the 16 sites annually the past two years and started the “response to determination” portion of the GSST system. The CDS State Level Advisory Board focused on one SPP indicator at each meeting. This ensures that there is knowledge at the management level to support each site in their

efforts to reach targets. The CDS State IEU has made it clear to regional sites that non-compliance is not acceptable. There is a growing acknowledgement at the staff, site director, and board management level that this is a serious undertaking and profile indicators with determinations of Needs Assistance or lower will be addressed through the “response to determination” portion of our GSST. This will involve self assessment, internal monitoring, and increasing levels of interaction between the site and the CDS State IEU.

Public reporting

Data profile designs based on the 2007-2008 performance and compliance data were developed for each Local Educational Agency (LEA), including CDS sites and School Administrative Units, in the state. The profiles provide indicator specific performance and compliance data to the LEA and to the public for use in program improvement. LEA performance profiles were made public with Informational Letter # 51 (http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu_letters&id=65681&v=article).

The LEA profiles are used as the basis for determinations of LEA program performance. Each indicator is evaluated for level of determination to provide the LEA with measurement specific feedback on their implementation of IDEA with regard to the SPP indicators. The individual determinations are then used to develop an overall determination with respect to the requirements of the State Performance Plan (SPP) in one of the four required categories: Meets Requirements; Needs Assistance; Needs Intervention; or Needs Substantial Intervention. These determinations set the level of support and intervention provided under Maine’s Continuous Improvement Monitoring Program (CIMP) discussed further below.

The process of improvement in the State is evolving. At the time of the origination of the SPP, LEAs understood very little of the requirements of the IDEA reauthorization of 2004. All data profiles, each revision of the SPP and APR, and all technical assistance documentation are posted on web pages on the Maine Department of Education website (Beginning at: <http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/index.html>).

Technical Assistance

During FFY2005, The Maine Department of Education (MDOE) developed an informative presentation that was delivered in regional meetings throughout the state to inform the LEA of the requirements of the law and reporting. The LEAs received detailed information on the SPP, the indicators and their intent, and an early glimpse of the expected consequences of poor performance or non-compliance. In FFY2006 the Department conducted a continuing series of informational and technical assistance meetings where the data for the first year of public reporting were shared using an indicator-by-indicator description of the performance measurements and the compliance requirements. These meetings provided an opportunity for LEAs to review their LEA specific data in a forum where data experts could respond to questions and encourage improvement planning. The data presented and discussed included the initial LEA determinations, a description of levels of determination, and the time-phased interventions and sanctions provided in IDEA law and regulation. During FFY 2007, the technical assistance became more intense and directed at specific LEAs demonstrating determination levels of

Needs Assistance and Needs Intervention. LEAs with the lowest determination levels were asked to contact the Maine Department of Education and RMC Research for additional support and technical assistance. Each LEA was provided with a self-assessment protocol and guidance to prepare an improvement plan addressing the determinations in their first year profile. Several LEAs completed the initial self-assessment. In FFY 2008, the intensity increased further with the evolution of CIMP.

Improvement and Corrective Action

The Maine Department of Education (MDOE) Office of Special Services implements a birth through age 20 General Supervision System Team (GSST) to oversee all aspects of performance improvement, compliance monitoring, and correction of non-compliance. Evaluations and interventions focus on improving infant, toddler and school-age student outcomes. The process is designed to enhance partnerships among the MDOE Office of Special Services, Child Development Services (CDS) sites, LEA, other educational and community agencies, service providers, and parents in implementing Part C and Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). These partnerships focus on early intervention and special education services and systems that directly impact results for children, and on the development and implementation of improvement strategies to address identified needs.

GSST coordinates improvement using an LEA-driven process founded on evidence-based decision-making and aligns with IDEA State Performance Plan (SPP) compliance and performance indicators. This alignment supports a close relationship between special education improvement planning and other LEA or community improvement planning efforts.

Training and Plan Development

Maine Department of Education developed and presented webinar training for LEA teams on the improvement planning process. LEA teams completed assignments for each section of the Self-Assessment thereby demonstrating their ability to translate the data findings in their LEA Profile to action steps in their Improvement/Corrective Action Plan. All parts of the training, the forms used and the supporting materials were made available on the website http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/spp_ta.html#all_indicators for LEA teams to use. The data analyses were then used to produce detailed improvement plans and corrective actions where performance or compliance data indicated. Department personnel and contactors reviewed all proposals to ensure alignment with data, adoption of evidenced-based strategies to accomplish needed improvements, and verification procedures for timely corrective actions.

Determination Levels of LEAs

All LEAs receive and review on a yearly basis a letter with their determination status, the rubric “Local Determination Levels Assistance and Enforcement”, and the LEA profile. Documents are available: <http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/spp/profiles.html>

Alignment with Nation Technical Assistance Resources

Maine contracts with technical assistance, professional development and dissemination resources throughout the State to provide scientifically based materials and instruction to educators, parents and interested parties. Contracts developed during the 2008-2009 school year include an objective requiring the contractor to serve as a liaison between the Department and national technical assistance centers that provide scientifically researched based resources that can be useful for Local Education Agencies (LEAs).

Maine sought and received technical assistance from national technical assistance centers to assist the State in its efforts to improve results in critical areas on performance and compliance highlighted in OSEP's June 1, 2009 determination response letter. These efforts are described in detail in the narrative of Indicators 15 and 20 in this report.

Child Development Services contracts with technical assistance, professional development and dissemination resources throughout the state to provide scientifically based materials and instruction to educators, parents and interested parties. Contracts developed with contractors during FFY2008 included an objective requiring the Provider to serve as a liaison between the Department and national technical assistance centers that provide scientifically researched based resources that can be useful for Local Education Agencies (LEAs). All contractors providing technical assistance to LEAs in the state are aligned with and engaging the services of national technical assistance centers in order to provide the most current best practice available.

Additionally, CDS has requested assistance in the areas of LRE for children three to five, natural environment birth to two, Expanding Inclusion Opportunities, child outcomes (COSF), transition C to B and preschool to kindergarten, General Supervision System, APR assistance, and data analysis from the Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC), NECTAC, OSEP, Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center, ITCA, and WESTAT. CDS State IEU personnel participate in OSEP, NECTAC, and NERRC teleconferences as frequently as possible. Maine CDS applied for and was chosen by ECO to be part of the framework partnership work that is underway.

The CDS State IEU was represented at the Data Managers Conference in June 2009, the NERRC Part C Virtual Conference in June 2009, The ECO Conference in June 2009, the Leadership Conference in DC August 2008, The Part C and 619 Coordinators Conference in DC in December 2009 and the WESTAT National Accountability Center Advisory Board meeting November 2009 (State Director is a member of this board).

Data System

Maine contracted with Infinite Campus to provide a statewide student data management system enhancement to the Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS). Features and capabilities have significantly improved data reporting ease while providing increased performance, data backups, and integral data validations. This reporting year, data were provided from the enhanced MEDMS for the 2008-2009 school year. The data are valid and reliable and a number of external and internal validations and confirmations ensure complete

and correct data entry. The Infinite Campus implementation of MEDMS provides a modern database system and industry standard forms designed to greatly simplify adapting the system to collect needed data. Reports of 618 child count, discipline, assessment performance, personnel, exits, and student demographic information are all compiled from a single data source in the MEDMS Infinite Campus implementation. Additionally, the Infinite Campus implementation is integrated with Maine's Longitudinal Data Grant (CFDA 84.372A) to ensure compatibility of the data system with the State's future requirements and historical data stores.

Consolidation

Maine continues its LEA consolidation efforts across the State. During the 2006-2007 school year, LEAs across the State began conversations about developing partnerships with nearby school administrative units about the possibility of regionalizing to achieve savings as required in the legislation without adversely affecting students in the classroom. These alignments and conversations have been guided in part by the data developed through the SPP process. An expectation of the consolidation process is that LEAs will become larger as communities combine resources and identify with one another. This will help compensate for Maine's declining enrollment by building larger service areas for the students educated in the newly defined regions, but it also will change the data associated with those students in a way that will compromise comparison of LEA percentages until the consolidation effort is complete.

Summary

The next page displays a brief summary of indicator performance to Maine's State Performance Plan. The chart compares data presented in the FFY 2007 Annual Performance Report, the targets for FFY 2008, and indicator performance for FFY 2008.

Federal Fiscal Year 2008 Part B Annual Performance Report

Summary of Progress toward Maine's State Performance Plan

SPP Indicator	FFY 2007 Performance				FFY 2008 Target				FFY 2008 Performance			
1. Graduation Rate	76%				82%				70%			
2. Dropout Rate	3.7%				3.0%				3.8%			
3. Assessment	AYP Reading		92.0%		AYP Reading		97%		AYP Reading		95%	
	AYP Math		99.2%		AYP Math				AYP Math			
	Participation Reading				Participation Reading				Participation Reading			
	4 th	8 th	11 th		98%				98%			
	99.6%	98.0%	92.5%									
	Participation Math				Participation Math				Participation Math			
	4 th	8 th	11 th		98%				99%			
	99.6%	98.1%	95.7%									
	Proficiency Reading				Proficiency Reading				Proficiency Reading			
	4 th	8 th	11 th		3 rd – 8 th		HS		3 rd – 8 th		HS	
	31.5%	28.8%	16.2%		58%		64%		35%		15%	
	Proficiency Math				Proficiency Math				Proficiency Math			
4 th	8 th	11 th		3 rd – 8 th		HS		3 rd – 8 th		HS		
36.3%	18.7%	12.9%		50%		43%		32%		11%		
4. Discipline	0.97%				1.70%				0.03%			
5. LRE (6-21)	Regular Class		57%		Regular Class		63%		Regular Class		53%	
	Self-Contained		11.5%		Self-Contained		9%		Self-Contained		11.6%	
	Separate		3.5%		Separate		3.5%		Separate		3.1%	
6. LRE (3-5)												
7. Developmental Outcomes (children age 3-5)		A	B	C		A	B	C		A	B	C
	did not improve	20%	23%	8%	did not improve	No targets (Targets set this year - FFY 2008)			did not improve	7%	8%	7%
	improved not nearer	15%	24%	15%	improved not nearer				improved not nearer	23%	21%	21%
	improved nearer	17%	29%	20%	improved nearer				improved nearer	32%	35%	21%
	improved comparable	17%	14%	17%	improved comparable				improved comparable	20%	21%	19%
	maintained	31%	10%	39%	maintained				maintained	17%	14%	32%
8. Parent Involvement	89%				87%				91%			
9. Disproportionality in Special Education	0%				0%				0%			
10. Disproportionality in Disability	0%				0%				0%			
11. Timeliness	94.6%				100%				91.3%			
12. Transition, age 3	100%				100%				95.3%			
13. Transition, age 16	95.3%				n/a				n/a			
14. Post-school outcomes	77%				n/a				n/a			
15. Compliance Monitoring	92.5%				100%				93%			
16. Complaints	100%				100%				100%			
17. Hearings	100%				100%				100%			
18. Resolution Sessions	60%				40%				50%			
19. Mediations	83%				80%				86%			
20. Reporting	82.6%				100%				95.3%			

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

Measurement:

Data and calculations of graduation rate calculation for students with disabilities is the same data and calculation as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

The definition of high school graduation rate is to compare the number of students that entered ninth grade with the number that receive a regular high school diploma in accordance with Maine 05-071 CMR Ch. 127 by the end of the fourth year after entering ninth grade for the first time. For students with an IEP, or LEP students with a Personal Learning Plan that extends the time to earn a high school diploma, up to six years can be allowed and will be also counted separately. Extending the timeframe for completion allows this federal accountability criterion to align with Maine's established accountability system.

Maine determines the graduation rate as follows:

The numerator is the total graduates with a regular diploma of yearⁿ

The denominator is the sum of the total graduates of yearⁿ + the sum of the total completers of yearⁿ plus the sum of All Graduates Yearⁿ + Grade 12 dropouts of yearⁿ + the sum of Grade 11 dropouts of yearⁿ⁻¹ + the sum of Grade 10 dropouts of yearⁿ⁻² + the sum of Grade 9 dropouts of yearⁿ⁻³

Regular Diploma Recipients

(All Graduates Yearⁿ + Grade 12 dropouts of yearⁿ + the sum of Grade 11 dropouts of yearⁿ⁻¹ + the sum of Grade 10 dropouts of yearⁿ⁻² + the sum of Grade 9 dropouts of yearⁿ⁻³)

This rate includes "Other Completers" as well as regular graduates in the denominator

Graduation Rate for 2008:

Total Regular Diploma Recipients 2007/08	Total Other Diploma Recipients 2007/08	Total All Diplomas (Completers) 2007/08	Total Dropouts 12th Grade 2007/08	Total Dropouts 11th Grade 2006/07	Total Dropouts 10th Grade 2005/06	Total Dropouts 9th Grade 2004/05	Total Completers & Dropouts	Graduation Rate
1,585	20	1,605	270	231	104	51	2,261	70.10%

Percent = $[1585 / (1605 + 270 + 231 + 104 + 51)] * 100 = 70$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
<i>2008</i>	<i>At least 82% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma</i>
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
<i>2008</i>	<i>70% of youth with IEPs graduated from high school with a regular diploma</i>

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

Calculations and data for the 2008 graduates are the same as those used for reporting under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). However, in previous years Maine used a High School Completion rate calculation for graduation rate because data for special education students could not be disaggregated by grade. The reported Actual Target Data for FFY2008 are not comparable with data reported in previous years.

Targets for graduation rate were established based on historical performance and improvement expectations using the High School Completion rate calculation described in the State Performance Plan (SPP). To provide a comparable performance measurement, graduation data were applied to the original formula. The High School Completion Rate is the percentage of students who graduated from their high school with a regular diploma, rather than earning an alternative credential or dropping out of school sometime during their high school years. A separate completion rate is calculated for each graduating class, as in the "Class of 2004". The class completion rate is calculated as follows:

Percent = Number of Regular Diploma Recipients in a High School Class divided by (Number of Regular Diploma Recipients + Number of Graduates through Certificate/Fulfillment of I.E.P. Requirement + the number of dropout for the school year of students with disabilities ages 15 through 21)

Use this calculation yields a graduation rate of 78%, $1585/(1585+20+430) = .7788$ for 2008 graduation rate as previously defined. The rate represents an improvement over FFY2007 performance, but does not meet the target of 82% for 2008.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

Reporting graduation rate for Title 1 of ESEA will be changing next year to adopt an on-time graduation rate calculation. The definition of high school graduation rate will be the comparison of the number of students that entered ninth grade with the number that received a regular high school diploma in accordance with Maine Chapter 127 by the end of the fourth year after entering ninth grade for the first time. For students with an IEP, or LEP students with a Personal Learning Plan that extends the

time to earn a high school diploma, up to six years can be allowed and will be also counted separately. Extending the timeframe for completion allows this federal accountability criterion to align with Maine's established accountability system.

Maine will determine the graduation rate as follows:

The denominator will include all the cohort of all first-time ninth graders from four years earlier plus all transfers into this cohort minus all transfers out (e.g., death, emigrated to another country, etc.). The numerator will include only regular diploma recipients from the four-year cohort. Regular diplomas include diplomas received by Special Education students granted five/six years by their IEP, and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Education students granted five/six years as part of their documented Personal Learning Plans. In both of these cases the students will have met the requirements of the Maine *Learning Results* Standards. These cases will also be tabulated separately to allow them to be extracted to allow calculation of a pure four-year cohort graduation rate as necessary. This will then satisfy both NGA and NCLB graduation rate calculation requirements while aligning with Maine's established accountability system.

Chapter 127 Section 7.02.B states:

"The intent of the system of *Learning Results* is to provide the time that students need in order to meet the content standards. This may involve more or less than the typical four years of secondary school." Students who receive a GED or Adult Education Diploma are not counted as having received a high school diploma under this category.

NEW Graduation Rate Formula:

$$\left[\frac{\text{On-time graduates by year } x}{[(\text{first time 9}^{\text{th}} \text{ graders in year } x-4) + (\text{Transfers-In}) - (\text{Transfers-Out})]} \right] \times 100$$

For the graduation rate for the class of 2008, Maine compared the number of students who entered ninth grade for the first time four years earlier in the fall of 2004 and received a "regular" diploma in 2008. For this calculation the denominator contains the cohort of all first time ninth graders from four years earlier plus all transfers into this cohort minus all transfers out (e.g., death, moving to another Maine school). The numerator contained only "regular" diploma recipients from the four year cohort. "Regular" diplomas include diplomas received by students granted five/six years by their IEP, and Limited English Proficient (LEP) students granted five/six years as part of their documented Personal Learning Plans. In both of these cases the students met the requirements of the Maine *Learning Results*. These five/six year "regular" diploma recipients are tabulated separately allowing them to be extracted in order to produce a four-year cohort graduation rate. This

approach satisfies both the NGA and NCLB graduation requirements while aligning with Maine's practice of allowing students with disabilities and LEP students more than four years to meet Maine's "regular" diploma standards.

Setting new Targets:

Maine's stakeholder group will be evaluating the impact of these changes on students with IEPs and will set targets in the SPP. Data for 2009 graduates will be available by February 2010 to provide basis for the analysis. Baseline performance will be established for the new calculation method using those data and targets will be determined for the remainder of the SPP. The review is anticipated to occur during the spring of 2010, with new targets developed by June 2010. At that time, the SPP will be revised to introduce the new calculation method, and include discussion of its implications, and new target values.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

Measurement:

Data and calculations of the graduation rate calculation for students with disabilities are the same data and calculation as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

The number students with IEPs dropping out of high school divided by the number of students with IEPs enrolled in high school.

Percent = $[(\# \text{ students with IEPs recorded as dropouts}) \div (\# \text{ students with IEPs secondary enrollment})]$ times 100

Percent = $[(430/11371)] * 100 = 3.8$

The same data are used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
<i>2008</i>	<i>A dropout rate of 3.0% or lower for students with IEPs</i>
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
<i>2008</i>	<i>3.8% dropout rate for students with IEPs</i>

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

The data presented for FFY 2008 are complete and accurate; the data include dropouts and enrollment from all 137 public high schools in the State. 420 dropouts were recorded among 11,371 secondary students, for a dropout rate of 3.8% using the calculation methods presented in the measurement description above and in the SPP. Actual performance for dropout rate data does not meet the target established for FFY 2008.

The Continuous Improvement Monitoring Program Birth through 20 (CIMP) requires the self-assessment sections to result in an individualized improvement plan. The CIMP includes a self-assessment (Section 3) which is an in-depth self assessment of this indicator. This component has been developed by RMC Arlington VA by reviewing scientifically researched prototypes that have been formatted for Maine. By ranking six statements regarding Graduation Policies, Courses, and Programs of Study and four statements on High

School Completion Data and Activities, the LEA has developed its own rubric with a rating score and priority rank. The items for improvement are targeted and transferred to the Improvement/Corrective Action Plan.

The indicator-specific self-assessment was adapted for Maine by RMC Arlington VA from School Dropout Prevention Program Self-Assessment Rubric (Maine Dropout Prevention Guide, 2006); Dropout Prevention Planning Guidebook: A Guide for School District Planning and Self-Assessment Tool (Reinvesting in Youth Dropout Prevention Initiative, 2006); and the National Standards and Quality Indicators for Secondary Education and Transition Self Assessment (National Alliance for Secondary Education and Transition, 2005).

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

Alignment with the ESEA reporting method required a minor change in the calculation of dropout rate. The original SPP measurement was calculated using secondary enrollment determined by age because the data system was incapable of disaggregating special education students by attending grade. The Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS) now has the disaggregation capability for the special education subgroup, so the population is determined by grade. The dropout rate calculation no longer includes the words “ages 14 through 21” in the denominator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

State assessment participation and proficiency targets and measurement have been aligned with ESEA and use the same data as are used for accountability reporting under ESEA. Measurable and Rigorous Target values for FFY 2008 and subsequent years have been revised in the SPP to adopt the targets in the ESEA accountability plan. The format for presentation of data follows the guidelines presented in the “Optional APR Template For B3” provided on the Regional Resource Center website.

Website: (<http://spp-apr-calendar.rrfcnetwork.org/search/results/sort/default/bi/3>)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- Percent of the LEAs with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup.
- Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

Measurement:

A. AYP percent = [(# of LEAs with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of LEAs that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)] times 100.

$$\text{AYP percent} = [(234) / (247)] * 100 = 95$$

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

$$\text{Math} = [(3022 + 12279 + 1245) / 16893] * 100 = 98$$

$$\text{Reading} = [(2896 + 12275 + 1299) / 16893] * 100 = 99$$

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].

Subject	Grades 3 through 8	High School	All IEP students
Math	$911+2879+821/14661*100 = 32$	$[(63+79+114)/2232]*100 = 11$	$[(974+2958+935)/16893]*100 = 29$
Reading	$095+3268+717/14661*100 = 35$	$[(92+116+123)/2232]*100 = 15$	$[(1187+3384+840)/16893]*100 = 32$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008						
2008	A. LEAs Meeting AYP for disability subgroup.		B. Participation for students with IEPs		C. Proficiency for students with IEPs		
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Grade
	97%		98%	98%	58%	50%	3 – 8
					64%	43%	High school
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008						
2008	A. LEAs Meeting AYP for disability subgroup.		B. Participation for students with IEPs		C. Proficiency for students with IEPs		
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Grade
#	234/247		16577/16893	16655/16893	5080/14661	4611/14661	3 – 8
%	95%		98%	99%	35%	32%	
#					331/2232	256/2232	High school
%					15%	11%	

Actual Target Data for FFY2008 (discussion and disaggregated data):

A. Percent of the LEAs with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is calculated annually for all schools (not LEAs) with student populations larger than 41. Determination of AYP of LEAs with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup is accomplished by verifying that ALL eligible schools in the LEA meet AYP for BOTH reading and math performance for students with disabilities. In order to meet the AYP target for the subgroup, the LEA must have met ESEA benchmarks in BOTH reading and math. Targets and target data are therefore to be reported overall (reading and math), not separately for reading and math. The SPP targets have been adjusted to meet these requirements. Performance did not meet the target in FFY2008.

Year	Total Number of LEAs	Number of LEAs Meeting the “n” size	Number of LEAs that meet the minimum “n” size and met AYP for FFY 2008	Percent of LEAs
FFY 2008 (2008-2009)	247	247	234	94.74%

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

The participation rate for children with IEPs in the math assessment exceeded the target.

Disaggregated Target Data for Math Participation:

Statewide Assessment – 2008-2009		Math Assessment							
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade HS	Total
									# %
a	Children with IEPs	2414	2383	2479	2468	2428	2489	2232	16893 100%
b	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	445	367	307	371	365	380	787	3022 18%
c	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1759	1860	2000	1877	1824	1862	1097	12279 73%
d	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards								
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards								
f	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	184	137	148	178	202	182	214	1245 7%
g	Overall (b+c+d+e) Baseline	2204	2227	2307	2248	2189	2242	1884	15301 91%
Children included in a but not included in the other counts above*									
Account for any children with IEPs that were not participants in the narrative.		15	6	13	15	13	23	24	109 1%

*Included in the number of children with IEPs, but not in the participating students, are those students with special considerations, plus 14 high school students with their results on hold.

The participation rate for children with IEPs in the reading assessment met the target.

Disaggregated Target Data for Reading Participation:

Statewide Assessment – 2008-2009		Reading Assessment							
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11	Total
									# %
a	Children with IEPs	2414	2383	2479	2468	2428	2489	2232	16893 100%
b	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	437	351	298	355	367	379	709	2896 17%
c	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1757	1860	1992	1881	1819	1877	1089	12275 73%
d	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards								
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards								
f	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	194	155	164	187	205	178	216	1299 8%
g	Overall (b+c+d+e) Baseline	2194	2211	2290	2236	2186	2256	1798	15171 90%
Children included in <i>a</i> but not included in the other counts above*									
Account for any children with IEPs that were not participants in the narrative.		14	6	13	16	14	21	23	107 1%

*Included in the number of children with IEPs, but not in the participating students, are those students with special considerations, plus 14 high school students with their results on hold.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

The math proficiency rate for children with IEPs is below the target. Since the measurement and targets changed this year to align with ESEA and disaggregated data for all individual grades tested were not reported last year, the only measure comparable with data reported in FFY2007 is overall proficiency in all tested grades. In FFY2007 overall math proficiency was 27% compared with 29% this year, so the math proficiency rate improved overall.

Disaggregated Target Data for Math Performance: # and % of students with IEPs that scored proficient or higher

Statewide Assessment – 2007-2008		Math Assessment Performance							Total	
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade HS	#	%
a	Children with IEPs	2414	2383	2479	2468	2428	2489	2232	16893	
b	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	253	191	145	124	104	94	63	974	6%
c	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	666	641	678	348	322	224	79	2958	18%
d	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards									
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards									
f	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	176	128	110	154	132	121	114	935	6%
g	Overall (b+c+d+e) Baseline	919	832	823	472	426	318	142	3932	23%

The reading proficiency rate for children with IEPs is below the target. Since the measurement and targets changed this year to align with ESEA and disaggregated data for all individual grades tested were not reported last year, the only measure comparable with data reported in FFY2007 is overall proficiency in all tested grades. In FFY2007 overall reading proficiency was 29% compared with 32% this year, so the reading proficiency rate improved overall.

Disaggregated Target Data for Reading Performance: # and % of students with IEPs that scored proficient or higher

Statewide Assessment – 2007-2008		Reading Assessment Performance							Total	
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade HS	#	%
a	Children with IEPs	2414	2383	2479	2468	2428	2489	2232	16893	
b	IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	219	199	156	166	185	170	92	1187	7%
c	IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	495	680	518	510	640	425	116	3384	20%
d	IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards									
e	IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards									
f	IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	147	133	85	118	115	119	123	840	5%
g	Overall (b+c+d+e) Baseline	714	879	674	676	825	595	208	4571	27%

Discussion of Data:

Data presented for participation and performance in this indicator are the same as reported in Table 6, submitted both as an attachment to this APR and separately to Westat on January 30, 2009. These data are validated during the initial reporting stages of the AYP process: counts of students are checked against the reported attending population on the tested date and confirmed by the Superintendent of the LEA; scores are confirmed by Measured Progress using data validation rules contracted with the Maine Department of Education.

Percent of LEA meeting AYP for the disability subgroup did not meet the target; participation in both math and reading met the target; and proficiency in both math and reading did not meet the target, but improved from FFY2007.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

Title IA works directly with school staff to review the participation and performance rates of all students (whole group and subgroups) which include students with IEPs. For schools experiencing challenges with participation rates, Title IA reviews current practices, provides technical assistance related to best practices, and works with the CIPS schools to create a plan for success. In order to help schools improve math and reading performance, Title IA starts by teaching staff how to conduct a review of annual assessment data, looking at gap analysis and trends. Title IA then assists the school in conducting a needs assessment and to explore root causes for poor performance.

Improvement activities implemented this year were aligned with public dissemination of data and determination of LEAs based on the FFY2007 performance and compliance results. The FFY2007 statewide assessment data were disaggregated to the LEA level and presented as a part of the LEA performance profiles made public with Informational Letter # 51 so that LEAs, parents and other interested parties could review LEA performance and take appropriate actions. Assessment data were not included in the determination structure because to do so created a redundancy with Adequate Yearly Progress assignments made by NCLB. However, the data were included in the profiles and are included in the improvement plan templates provided during technical assistance support.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

The measurement of participation as defined in the Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) Part B Indicator Measurement Table is not exactly the same as the way that Maine established its targets in the SPP. In order to align with ESEA, SPP targets were reset for the remaining years of the SPP (FFY2008 through FFY2011) as necessary. AYP is now calculated as a single measure of LEA performance for both math and reading. Participation rates were changed to 95% in order to align with ESEA participation targets established in January 2009 as shown in the Maine NCLB Accountability Workbook (http://www.maine.gov/education/nclb/state_app/workbook.pdf), section 3.2. Proficiency rates were changed to align with the Annual Measureable Objectives in the Maine NCLB Accountability Workbook, section 3.2c, Table 3.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State)] times 100 = $[(0)/(247)] * 100 = 0$

Maine also measures the rate of suspension and expulsion using a simple rate formula (data from Table 5, section 3A):

Percent = [(number of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for more than 10 days) divided by the (number of students with disabilities)] times 100 = $[(10)/(33284)] * 100 = .03$

B. Percent = [(# of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State)] times 100.

State's definition of significant discrepancy:

The following decision rules were used to determine if there was a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions of children with disabilities:

- The LEA has to have a minimum of 10 students;
- The number of students suspended or expelled has to be greater than 1;
- The percentage of special education students suspended/expelled in the LEA has to be at least 3.5 times greater than that the three year average for ALL special education students suspended and expelled (the SEA average).

If an LEA met these 3 conditions it was considered to have a significant discrepancy between its rate of suspension/expulsion for students with IEPs and the state average for suspensions/expulsions of students with IEPs.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
2008	<i>Reduce the suspension expulsion rate for students with IEPs from 1.70% to 1.65%. Maintain the number of LEAs with significant discrepancies at 0</i>
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
2008	Suspension and expulsion rate for students with IEPs = 0.03% The number of LEAs with significant discrepancies = 0

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

Performance met the targets for this indicator. No LEA exceeded the limit for significant discrepancy for rates of suspension/expulsion overall, or by ethnicity. The rate of suspension/expulsion of students with disability continues to be below the target.

The Maine Department of Education Office of Special Services maintains an active affiliation with the Office of Substance Abuse (OSA) of the Maine Department of Health and Human Services. During the last two years, personnel from these offices have acted in concert by drafting Informational Letters for the Commissioner, presenting workshops for the LEAs and fielding their questions. Questions focused on the OSA/IDEA requirements, the need for integration, and additional data definitions necessitated by the integration. These actions accelerated the transition of data collection from the website to an integrated data collection and report system in Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS)/Infinite Campus. Recent results (January 2009) indicate LEAs are responding with valid and reliable data.

OSA offered activities and they are listed by the following categories of the self-assessment that will be used to further improvements for LEAs during 2009-10.

Behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS):

OSA provided financial and personnel support for "Prevention Works for Me! - 2nd Annual Maine Alliance to Prevent Substance Abuse -Prevention Convention, November 14, 2008".

Workshops:

- Know it's Out there. How to find Resources, Data and Grants to Support your Prevention Program
- Creating School Policies
- Working with Law Enforcement
- Substance Abuse Prevention 101

Alternatives to suspension/expulsion:

Safe and Drug-Free Schools (SDFS) regular grants to all Maine LEAs provide funds for a variety of these types of programs (alternatives to suspensions/ expulsions, counseling, etc.).

Policy development on prevention or intervention that prevents suspension/expulsion:

OSA developed a new School Policy Guide: “Youth Substance Abuse Policy – A comprehensive Guide for Schools” Maine Office of Substance Abuse, May, 2008.

<http://www.maine.gov/dhhs/osa/prevention/schoolcollege/policyguide.htm>

Assist LEAs analyze their data:

DOE Office of Management Information Systems has provided technical assistance through web training and training to school secretaries on how to submit their school incidence data; and OSA has provided workshops and manuals in the past on how to analyze and use incidence and prevalence data. Example: “The MYDAUS/YTS Guide – Maine Youth Drug and Alcohol use Survey and Youth Tobacco Survey”, Office of Substance Abuse, Maine DHHS, 2007”

OSA regularly distributes (through a list serve of LEA SDFS coordinators), prevention news information that includes notices of various workshops, conferences, training opportunities, etc. in all of these areas.

Improvement activities implemented this year were aligned with public dissemination of data and determination of LEAs based on the FFY2006 performance and compliance results. The FFY2006 statewide suspension/expulsion rate data were disaggregated to the LEA level and presented as a part of the LEA performance profiles made public with Informational Letter # 51

(http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu_letters&id=65681&v=article) so that LEAs, parents and other interested parties could review LEA performance and take appropriate actions. The LEAs received direct mailing of additional copies of their data in a profile that included determinations of performance on critical performance measures and an overall determination level assignment. Determinations were a part of the LEA improvement process designed to promote improvement in specific SPP indicators accompanied by invitation to technical assistance and improvement planning provided by Maine Department of Education and its contractors.

Maine improved its collection for FFY2008 data as the collection was done using the Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS)/Infinite Campus implementation. Informational Letter # 49

(http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu_letters&id=65460&v=article) provided guidance for the collection of data and described the requirements in detail. This collection simplifies the entry process by using the same mechanism for tracking disciplinary action as is used for all other student data collection. Data validations are incorporated into

the Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS)/Infinite Campus State Edition Behavior Module to ensure valid codes and student information are entered. On-line training and help-desk support were provided to all LEAs.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

No changes.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100 = $[(18080)/(33284)] * 100 = 55$
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100 = $[(3872)/(33284)] * 100 = 11.6$
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100 = $[(1058)/(33284)] * 100 = 3.1$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008		
2008	<i>Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</i>	<i>Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</i>	<i>In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</i>
	<i>Greater than 63%</i>	<i>Less than 9%</i>	<i>Less than 3.5%</i>
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008		
2008	Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements
	54.3%	11.6%	3.1%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

The percentage of children served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements met the target. The percentage of

children served in the regular classroom and the percentage of students served in self-contained placements did not meet targets.

Improvement activities implemented this year were aligned with public dissemination of data and determination of LEAs based on the FFY2006 performance and compliance results. The FFY2006 statewide graduation rate data were disaggregated to the LEA level and presented as a part of the LEA performance profiles made public with Informational Letter # 51

(http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=edu_letters&id=65681&v=article) so that LEAs, parents and other interested parties could review LEA performance and take appropriate actions. The LEAs received direct mailing of additional copies of their data in a profile that included determinations of performance on critical performance measures and an overall determinations level assignment. Determinations are part of the LEA improvement process designed to promote improvement in specific SPP indicators through technical assistance and improvement planning provided by Maine Department of Education and its contractors.

Overall determination levels presented on the determination profiles initiate specific actions as described in “Local Determinations Levels Assistance and Enforcement Actions”. Additionally, the individual determination of the performance on this indicator requires action by the LEA if the determination is Needs Assistance or lower. The degree of action and extent of sanction increases as the determination worsens. LEAs with high performance levels on this indicator will be reviewed for promising practices transferrable to lower performing LEAs.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

No changes.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility

Measurement:

A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program)}}{\text{(total \# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.

B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility)}}{\text{(total \# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
<i>2008</i>	<i>To be determined</i>
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
<i>2008</i>	<i>Not reported in FFY2008</i>

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

Data for preschool settings is not required to be reported this year.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

No changes.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 7: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);**
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and**
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.**

Measurement:

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d) divided by [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e) divided by the [total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social	Number of	% of
---	-----------	------

relationships):	children	children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	19	7.4
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	60	23.3
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	83	32.3
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	52	20.2
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	43	16.7
Total	N=257	100%
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	21	8.2
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	55	21.4
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	90	35.0
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	54	21.0
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	37	14.4
Total	N=257	100%
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	18	7.0
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	55	24.0
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers	53	20.6

but did not reach		
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	49	19.1
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	82	31.9
Total	N=257	100%

Summary Statements	% of children
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	63.1
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	37.0
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	65.5
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	35.4
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	58.3
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	51.0

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

CDS has been involved in the use of the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) since 2005. Since that time we have moved from three sites piloting the COSF to all sites submitting the COSF. The state has adopted the use of the ECO COSF with minor adaptations to the identifying information. Training has occurred with staff from ECO and NECTAC on two occasions.

Trainings with ECO and NECTAC occurred in January 2007 and in November 2008. Since that time ongoing technical assistance has occurred through Lunch and Learn sessions and by regular contact between the CDS State IEU and the regional site personnel. The first Administrative Letter that was given to the regional sites indicates their responsibility for COSF was effective April 1, 2007 ([Administrative Letter #2](#)). An updated Administrative Letter has gone into effect as of February 4, 2009 ([Administrative Letter #14](#)). With Administrative Letter #14 regional sites were provided with an updated decision tree, guidelines, and a developmental milestone checklist. The most recent guidance documents were developed by personnel who attended the November 2008 training. Since that training we have moved from having all COSFs submitted on paper with a staff person at the CDS State IEU entering them into a database to having all the forms submitted electronically. This transition has provided CDS State IEU staff additional time to review the information being submitted for accuracy and completeness. The form has been modified throughout the year to ensure information collected is accurate and reliable. In FFY2007, 59 children were assessed and in FFY2008 121 children were assessed.

In addition to the technical assistance and training provided to the regional site personnel, the CDS State IEU has been chosen to be one of the 9 Framework Partner States through ECO. With the assistance of Maine's ECO support team, the CDS State IEU has identified goals to help move our COSF system even further. Over the next two years, as part of the framework partnership, we will assist ECO to develop their COSF Framework and they will assist us to develop parent friendly information, develop strategies to make the COSF process included into the IFSP/IEP process, and assist us to develop training materials. The CDS State IEU will use the materials to provide training to all Early Care and Education personnel in Maine on the understanding and importance of Child and Family Outcomes. In June of 2009 the birth to five consultant for Intervention, Programming and Staff Development attended the National Outcomes and Data Conferences. She presented with an ECO Representative and two other states at the Outcomes Conference on COSF Quality Assurance. The birth to five consultant for Intervention, Programming, and Staff Development will ensure this process continues on its path of growth.

The outcome measure system for Maine includes:

- A. Policies and procedures to guide outcome assessment and measurement practices,
- B. Provision of training and technical assistance supports to administrators and service providers in outcome data collection, reporting, and use,

- C. Quality assurance and monitoring procedures to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the outcome data,
- D. Data system elements for outcome data input and maintenance, and outcome data analysis functions,
- E. Measurement strategies used to collect data,
- F. The criteria used to determine whether a child's functioning was "comparable to same aged peers".

A. Policies and procedures to guide outcome assessment and measurement practices

The population of children for whom outcome data is collected includes all children aged 0-5 who are determined eligible for services and who have an IFSP or IEP. Entry, annual and exit information is gathered on all children who have been in services for more than six months.

A full and individualized evaluation of a child's present level of functioning must be conducted to determine eligibility prior to entry into the CDS system. In 2005, work was begun to clarify the necessary distinctions in eligibility between IDEA Part C and Part B 619 children. The Assessment Committee has reviewed various early childhood assessment systems and has created a list of acceptable assessments for children aged 3-5. In FFY2008 CDS State IEU, MDOE and Maine Administrators of Services for Children with Disabilities held regional conferences for CDS sites, providers and PreK- 3 public school educators and administrators. As part of this conference, acceptable assessments will be discussed.

The eligibility of children must be determined by using multiple sources of data and must not be dependent upon a single test score. Evaluation procedures may include, but are not limited to, observations, interviews, behavior checklists, structured interactions, play assessment, adaptive and developmental scales, criterion-referenced and norm-referenced instruments, and clinical judgment. It is recommended that observations to document areas of strength and areas that are of concern for the child be made in his or her least restrictive environment. This is the setting within the community where infants, toddlers and preschool children without disabilities are usually found (e.g., home, child care, Head Start).

The Case Manager (service coordinator) is responsible for collecting and documenting enough information for the team to be able to determine the early childhood outcomes rating for the child (on a scale of 1-7 on the Child Outcomes Summary Form). This discussion is becoming a natural part of the IFSP/IEP meeting. The information gathered includes evaluations and assessments, information provided by the parents of the child, and observations by caregivers and other service providers. Initial levels of performance in the three outcome areas of this indicator will serve as the first data point. CDS sites will also assess all children annually, prior to the renewal of the IFSP, or to transition from Part C to Part B 619. Assessments will also be administered to all children exiting the system who have received services for at least six months.

B. Provision of training and technical assistance supports to administrators and service providers in outcome data collection, reporting, and use

Technical assistance (TA) occurs frequently and is available at any time for all site personnel. An example of the continuous availability for TA is when the COSFs are submitted. At that time, they are reviewed for accuracy. If there is information that is omitted, misplaced, missing, incomplete, inaccurate or unclear the form is returned to the Site Director and/or Case Manager to be reviewed, completed and resubmitted. If the corrections needed are not clear then the Data Distinguished Educator provides TA to the personnel to ensure their competence in the area. The Programming, Intervention, Staff Development and Monitoring consultant is also available to provide TA to all sites and site personnel. CDS has a training committee that meets monthly to discuss training needs for the system. The training committee recommended that Lunch and Learn sessions be conducted as a refresher to staff as follow up to the November 2008 training done by NECTAC/ECO.

Maine has been selected as one of the seven Framework Partner States with the Early Childhood Outcomes Center. This relationship has been an extremely valuable resource in providing our sites with up to date information and assistance. A representative from ECO met with our Training Committee to discuss implementation processes, usage of, barriers and needs in relation to the COSF. The information gathered was used in developing the Lunch and Learn refresher and is being used to develop information to be shared with the personnel required to monitor and complete the COSF.

The CDS website (<http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/cosf/index.html>) has been an area of value in providing information and resources in relation to outcomes. Policy statements ([Administrative Letter #14](#)), guidance documents, sample Developmental Milestones, Maine's Early Learning and Infant Toddler Guidelines, COSF, and useful resources are all available on the website. By the end of the year we expect to have completed Training Modules available for training and orientation purposes. Additionally, the CDS State IEU is developing a COSF monitoring checklist to be used when monitoring files. The checklist will be used as part of an on site visit for a focused monitoring or for the regional site to review their COSF submissions.

In our work with the Framework we are discussing preparation of information to share with parents and staff to ensure understanding of the process used in Maine and how it is beneficial to their child. CDS State IEU staff will work with professionals throughout the Early Care and Education system to support understanding of the outcome data we are tracking and its use to foster growth and performance in programs.

C. Quality assurance and monitoring procedures to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the outcome data

As a part of the CDS monitoring process the file audit form and review ensure outcome information is included in the file. The information submitted is reviewed by the Data Distinguished Educator for completeness prior to entry into the central database. Error checks are built into the data system. Some regional sites have established internal monitoring and review processes prior to submission of the forms to the CDS State IEU.

Over the next year, one of the reports that the CDS State IEU will develop, to assist all of the Regional Site Directors, will include the children who have entered services and who do not have a COSF, if there has been over a year since an updated COSF has been submitted, and if children have exited and a COSF has not been submitted. This report will provide follow up to sites to ensure they are submitting the information required.

The CDS State IEU is developing a COSF monitoring checklist to be used when monitoring files. The checklist will be utilized as part of an on site visit for a focused monitoring or for the regional site to review their COSF submissions.

D. Data system elements for outcome data input and maintenance, and outcome data analysis

Data continues to be collected, entered and analyzed by the CDS State IEU. The electronic COSFs are submitted to the central office via email. Currently, all sites are submitting forms via email. The COSFs are completed in a standardized MS Word form that is updated on an as needed basis. Streamlining the process from a written process to electronic process has increased the validity of the COSF data, since human interaction has decreased. The State IEU reviews each form submitted for complete information prior to being entered into a central database. The forms are then electronically imported into the central database which is linked to Case-e to verify the information against the child record, previous COSF records, etc. This is an interim process being used while a web based system continues to be developed. Reports based on the data can be produced for other purposes by site or by child and or site.

E. Measurement strategies used to collect data

- Who is included in the measurement, i.e. what population of children? If sampling, share information about your sampling plan.
- What assessment/measurement tool(s) and/or other data sources were used?
- Who conducted the assessments?
- When did measurement occur?
- If multiple data sources were used, what method was used to summarize the data for each child? (e.g., the ECO-developed Child Outcome Summary Form, another method, etc.)
- What data was reported to the state, and how was the data transmitted? (e.g., Programs submit data on paper quarterly to the state agency, data entered through online data system, etc.)
- What data analysis methods were used to determine the progress categories?

In Maine all children aged 0-5 who receive Early Intervention Services receive an entry COSF. If children are in services for more than six months they then have a COSF done annually and at exit (from services or from Part C to Part B). For children in Part C they must receive either the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) or the Bailey evaluation (Administrative Letter #1, March 16, 2007). In addition to the Bayley or the Battelle, teams use observation, other evaluation and assessment tools, screening information and other input from the team

members. The assessments/evaluations are conducted by appropriately certified/trained individuals. Maine uses the COSF developed by ECO using the seven point rating scale. We have made state specific additions to the form which can be found at <http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/forms/cosf.doc>. All data is reported to the CDS State IEU. For this reporting year the forms have been submitted both electronically and through paper copies mail to the central office. One person in the central office is responsible for inserting all information into an internal database. The data has been analyzed using the ECO calculator, the state database and by CDS State IEU individuals.

The outcome ratings from entry data will be matched to exit outcome ratings for individual children. At the regional CDS sites and CDS central office levels, analysis of matched scores will yield for each of the three outcomes:

- a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning;
- b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers;
- c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same aged peers but did not reach it;
- d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same age peers; and
- e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same aged peers.

CDS central office will analyze the entry status of children, exit status, and the percentages of children who increased ratings from entry data to exit data (moved nearer to typical development) by site as well as by state.

F. The criteria used to determine whether a child’s functioning was “comparable to same aged peers”.

Maine utilize ECO COSF form where the rating 6 and 7 have been defined as the area that meets the OSEP definition requirement for “comparable to same aged peers”.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Maine has chosen to use the ECO [Summary Statements Calculator](#) to generate the baseline data for the table below. Data from the progress charts above are entered into the calculator for each outcome, and the calculator yields the percentages for the Summary Statements table.

Progress Data for Infants and Toddlers Exiting 2008-2009

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	19	7.4
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	60	23.3
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	83	32.3
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	52	20.2
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	43	16.7
Total	N=257	100%
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	21	8.2
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	55	21.4
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	90	35.0
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	54	21.0
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	37	14.4
Total	N=257	100%

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	18	7.0
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	55	21.4
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	53	20.6
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	49	19.1
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	82	31.9
Total	N=257	100%

Baseline Data for Infants and Toddlers Exiting 2008-2009

Summary Statements	% of children
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	63.1
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	37.0

Summary Statements	% of children
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	65.5
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	35.4
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	58.3
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	51.0

Explanation of currently reported progress data

This year's baseline data is based on 257 children who have exited, however, the intent is for all children to receive an initial, annual and/or exit Child Outcomes Summary Form completed. Therefore, the data is a representation of the children in the CDS program from all 16 regional sites. As previously mentioned, reports will be developed, to assist the regional sites in determining children who have entered services and who do not have a COSF, if there has been over a year since an updated COSF has been submitted, and if children have exited and a COSF has not been submitted. The reports will enable the sites to collect data on all children for future analysis and increase data quality.

A comparison from FFY2007 progress data to FFY2008 baseline data, shows an increase in the number of children reported for outcomes. Correspondingly, the percentage of children who did not improve functioning in FFY2007 has decreased in FFY2008 in all three outcome areas. This trend should continue based on more accurate data as staff continues to improve the quality, accuracy, and timeliness of the forms completed.

Measurable and Rigorous Target:

Targets for Infants and Toddlers Exiting in FFY 2009 (2009-10) and FFY 2010 (2010-2011) and Reported in Feb 2011 and Feb 2012

Summary Statements	Targets for FFY 2009 (% of children)	Targets for FFY 2010 (% of children)
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	63	64
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	37	38
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	66	67
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	35	36
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		
1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	58	59
2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	51	52

Targets for FFY2009 and FFY2010 have been set based on evaluation of our baseline data.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines						Resources
	FFY Year when activities will occur						
	05	06	07	08	09	10	
The Battelle II was piloted at three sites (Waterville, Bangor, and Androscoggin)	X						
ECT procedures and policies will be reviewed across CDS sites for consistency		X					
January 2007 on Child Outcomes Summary Form							
All sites will use the COSF		X	X	X	X	X	
Current data systems will be modified to capture, aggregate, and report the data by site		X					
A training and professional development system related to the child outcome assessment system will be developed and implemented.		X	X				
Continuing assessment of the data collection system			X	X	X	X	
Continuing training and professional development			X	X	X	X	

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100. $[(562+1583)/(620+1747)]*100= 91$

Note: A total 620 Part B 619 survey responses were received with 562 favorable. A total 1747 Part B school-aged survey responses were received with 1583 favorable.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
2008	<i>89% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</i>
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
2008	91% of parents with a child receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

The percentage of parents with a child receiving special education services who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities met the target. Surveys were mailed first class mail to parents of students with disabilities in LEAs and CDS sites; 11,291 surveys were mailed to parents of Part B children. A total of 2,367 responses was received for a response rate of 21%. The data were electronically captured from each of the surveys. The data were provided to the LEAs and CDS sites for their consideration in improvement planning. The data will be reviewed with the LEA or CDS site during program review where a decision on required action will be made.

Maine contracted with the Maine Parent Federation (MPF) for the 2009-2010 and subsequent school years due to a lack of sufficient resources within MDOE. MPF will contact the Child Development Services State Office and LEAs specified by the Department to obtain parent contact information. MPF will administer three types of surveys (Part C - birth to 2, Part B 619 for ages 3-5, and Part B school-age 5-20) along with a cover letter for DOE approval and signature. The Part B 619 and the Part B school-aged results will be reported in the Indicator 8 response of the FFY 2011 APR. After the initial administration, MPF will review the strengths and weaknesses of the survey administration process with the Department and make recommendations to the Department for improving the process of survey administration.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

No revisions.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Indicator 9: Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement:

Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification)}}{\text{(\# of LEAs in the State)}} \right] \times 100$
 times 100 = $\left[\frac{(0)}{(247)} \right] \times 100 = 0$

State's definition of disproportionate representation:

Disproportionate representation is defined as statistically significant difference between the identification rates of students with disabilities by ethnic proportion and the ethnic proportional representation overall within the LEA. A statistically significant difference is defined as representation three times the standard deviation estimate higher or lower than the LEA proportion for the specific subgroup population. See the SPP for this indicator for a detailed description of the analysis of disproportionate representation.

If an LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation, a review of the policies, practices and personnel (those associated with the student's IEP) must be done to determine that the LEA appropriately identified the student for special education services. "Inappropriate identification" would be any non-compliance in the IEP process that resulted in the student being identified incorrectly.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
2008	<i>0% of LEAs will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification.</i>
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
2008	0% of LEAs have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

Maine's examination of disproportionate representation includes all LEAs with greater than 10 students in ANY ethnic group. The analysis presents population sensitive confidence intervals that are then use to detect subgroup proportions that are significantly different than the proportion mean for the population. In the case of disproportionate representation, the LEA proportions for ethnic representation are compared to the LEA special education proportions; if the special education proportion is significantly different than the LEA overall proportions, they are identified for additional review.

Reporting year	Number of LEAs with ethnic proportions outside the estimated confidence intervals	Number of LEAs found to have disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification
FFY2008	0	0

LEA profiles used as the basis for determination include a compliance measure for disproportionate representation in special education identification and related services. For the purposes of determination, non-compliance with this (or any compliance indicator) results in a maximum overall determination of Needs Assistance.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

No revisions.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Indicator 10: Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement:

Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification)}}{\text{(\# of LEAs in the State)}} \right] \times 100$
 $= \left[\frac{(0)}{(247)} \right] \times 100 = 0$

State's definition of disproportionate representation:

Disproportionate representation is defined as statistically significant difference between the identification rates of students with disabilities by ethnic proportion and the ethnic proportional representation overall within the LEA. A statistically significant difference is defined as three times the standard deviation estimate for the specific subgroup population. See the SPP for this indicator for a detailed description of the analysis of disproportionate representation.

If an LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation, a review of the policies, practices and personnel (those associated with the student's IEP) must be done to determine that the LEA appropriately identified the student for special education services. "Inappropriate identification" would be any non-compliance in the IEP process that resulted in the student being identified incorrectly.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
2008	0% of LEAs
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
2008	0% of LEAs have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education categories resulting from inappropriate identification.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

Maine's examination of disproportionate representation includes all LEAs with greater than 10 students in ANY ethnic group; this includes all five ethnic groups (American Indian, Asian, Black, Caucasian, and Hispanic) for each disability. The analysis presents population sensitive confidence intervals that are then use to detect subgroup proportions that are significantly different than the proportion mean for the population. In the case of disproportionate representation in specific disability categories, the statewide proportions for ethnic representation are compared to the LEA special education disability category

proportions; if the special education proportion is significantly different than the State overall proportions they are identified for additional review.

For FFY2008, five LEAs in the State meet the minimum population requirements; one LEA in six specific disabilities (Autism, Emotional Disabilities, Multiple Disabilities, Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech and Language Impairment), the other four only in one disability (Speech and Language Impairment). Population values in all other disabilities fail to meet the minimum population requirements. No LEAs show possible disproportionate representation of students in specific disabilities (Multiple Disabilities, Other Health Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, and Speech and Language Impairment). No LEAs exhibit disproportionate representation that is statistically significant; therefore, none are a result of inappropriate identification.

LEA profiles used as the basis for determination include a compliance measure for disproportionate representation in specific disability categories. For the purposes of determination, non-compliance with this (or any compliance indicator) results in a maximum overall determination of Needs Assistance.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

No revisions.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

$$\text{Percent} = [(b) \text{ divided by } (a)] \text{ times } 100 = [(3609)/(3955)] * 100 = 91.3$$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
2008	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
2008	91.3% of children with parental consent to evaluate were evaluated and eligibility was determined within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

This measure did not meet the 100% compliance target, but improved from last year and previous years. Technical assistance provided to the LEAs and CDS sites has improved focus on critical aspects of the development and maintenance of IEP documentation and implementation of the required evaluations.

The number of findings for FFY2008 is shown below. Some of the findings have been closed, but verification of others is still in progress. During on-site monitoring reviews in the 2008-2009 school year, the evaluation timeline compliance was monitored in LEAs serving school aged children in LEAs and preschool children in CDS sites. Findings from the monitoring are shown in the table below:

Monitoring in FFY 2008	FFY 2007 (July 2007 - June 2008)		
Indicator 11 Findings	# of LEAs with findings	# of LEAs reviewed	# of LEAs compliant
Number of CDS sites (preschool)	2	16	14
Number of LEAs (school aged)	0	28	28

Timeline compliance for both preschool and school aged children is determined through review of IEP records during program monitoring. The data on findings indicates EIS/LEA level notification and responsibility, but the data for calculation of the indicator compliance are compiled from individual records reviewed during the on-site program review. Details of the review activities, findings of non-compliance, treatment of the findings and the status of correction are discussed below.

Section I - Part B 619 (Ages 3 through 5)

Interviews during monitoring of the sites highlighted an issue that effects timelines. Many case managers were waiting to receive evaluations from employed and contracted providers prior to setting up meetings. There was a lack of an established procedure to provide timelines for evaluators and it became clear this has been effecting our timeline compliance. The CDS State IEU provided documents for sites to utilize in order to meet state established timelines ([Administrative Letter #20](#) and [Administrative Letter #21](#)). The site directors were trained regarding this requirement in June 2009 at the B-20 Maine Special Education Leadership Conference.

The letters indicate clear expectations for CDS employees and contracted providers. Each regional site must track a referral for evaluation from beginning to end within the timelines. For employees who do not meet the timelines their deficiency becomes part of their personnel file. Contracted providers who do not provide the evaluation 15 days prior to the scheduled meeting (extraordinary circumstances honored) will not be paid for the evaluation. Adherence to these letters will be monitored in the early spring of 2010.

Due to the Emergency Regulations that went into effect on January 19, 2010 that changed the required timeline for evaluations in Part B from 60 calendar days to 45 school days the letters referenced above are in the process of being updated. The CDS State IEU will distribute new guidance on tracking timelines early in February 2010.

In addition to the Administrative Letters 20 and 21 the CDS State Director gave all providers the opportunity to participate in a Lunch and Learn session on the documented requirements on the part of regional personnel and on contracted professionals. The Lunch and Learn provided clarification on the change in evaluation requirements and reiterated the seriousness of meeting evaluation timelines.

Data was presented to MACECD in December of 2008 comparing sites that hire their own providers to complete the initial evaluations versus the sites that use contracted providers. This data was then compared to the sites overall compliance with Indicator B11. The data was reviewed by the Advisory Board and it led to the Advisory Board recommending in December of 2008 that, "The CDS sites employ providers rather than contract services for the purposes of evaluation. Expected impact of implementation of recommendations: All CDS sites will be in compliance for evaluations."

Of the 346 children for whom consent to evaluate was received but not completed on time, 198 were not completed on time due to scheduling issues within the CDS site, one was not completed on time due to evaluator availability, and 147 were not completed on time due to provider scheduling. All evaluations were completed within 65 school days, with a range of 46-65 school days for those completing late.

Correction of Non-compliance for Indicator B11 The CDS State IEU grouped individual instances of non-compliance by legal requirement and CDS site to make findings related to this indicator. To verify correction, subsequent data will be reviewed. In addition, The CDS State IEU required follow-up on each individual instance of non-compliance to ensure that services, when not provided timely, were in fact provided.					
Year of Findings	Total Findings of Non-compliance with Indicator B11	Findings verified as Corrected within One Year	Findings Subsequently Verified as Corrected	Total Findings Corrected as of Submission	Findings of Non-compliance Remaining
FFY 2008	2	2	5	7	8
FFY 2007	13				13
FFY 2006	There were no findings of non-compliance issued for indicator B11 during the FFY 06 Year				
FFY 2005	14		1	1	13

In addition to the activities documented for FFY2009, the following activities continue:

- Weekly webinars with individuals who routinely enter and use the Case-e data system. These webinars are interactive and provide an opportunity for clarifying conversations between regional site personnel and the CDS State IEU Data Manager.
- Compliance timelines are discussed and stressed to all CDS personnel and contract providers by all CDS State IEU personnel, CDS State IEU contracted individuals who provide regional site training, and by the Regional Site Directors.
- The CDS State IEU contract with two individuals to provide training to regional sites in the areas determined by the CDS State IEU Director as a result of Letters of Findings, data system reviews, as well as queries and requests from the field.
- CDS State IEU continuing use of, and reference to, Part C Process Chart for employee use
(<http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/documents/PartCProcessChart.doc>)
- The CDS State IEU provides Lunch and Learn sessions to CDS personnel. These remain a proven method of outreach and training to staff throughout the state based on feedback from personnel. The Lunch and Learn sessions are used to

provide clarifying information on a variety of issues that have been discovered through monitoring, through requests from the field and/or consultants and based on information provided to the CDS State IEU. A focus of the Lunch and Learn sessions are on the clarification, practice and understand of the Part C Federal and State Regulations. As we move into the next fiscal year the Lunch and Learn sessions will expand to discuss best practices and strategies to meet OSEP indicator and MUSER requirements. The success of the Lunch and Learn sessions was shared by the Director at the 2009 Leadership conference attended by the regional site directors.

Section II - Part B School Aged (6 to 20)

During the focused monitoring visits in FFY 2008, no LEA was found non-compliant to the 60-timeline requirement.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

No revisions.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Measurement:

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B (LEA notified pursuant to 637(a)(9)(A)) for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.
- # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, d or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100 = [(553) divided by (653-48-1-24)]*100 = 95.3

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
2008	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
2008	95.3% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 were found eligible for Part B, and had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

The data for FFY2008 APR shows a decrease in compliance in relation to FFY2007. The significant increase is due the adjustment of the denominator based on instructions from OSEP. Despite continued efforts by the CDS State IEU there continue to be difficulties for the regional sites to meet the timeline to complete initial evaluations for children referred. Regional sites use a mix of employed staff and contracted providers to provide evaluations for children. A limited study was completed to address the effectiveness of employed staff vs. contracted staff. This study showed sites that employed evaluators tended to have better timelines.

Interviews during monitoring of the sites highlighted an issue that affects timelines. Many case managers were waiting to receive evaluations from employed and contracted

providers prior to setting up meetings. There was a lack of an established procedure to provide timelines for evaluators and it became clear this has been effecting our timeline compliance. The CDS State IEU provided documents for sites to utilize to meet state established timelines. The site directors were trained regarding this initiative in June 2009 at the B-20 Maine Special Education Leadership Conference ([Administrative Letter #20](#) and [Administrative Letter #21](#))

The letters indicate clear expectations for CDS employees and contracted providers. Each regional site must track a referral for evaluation from beginning to end within the timelines. For employees who do not meet the timelines their deficiency becomes part of their personnel file. Contracted providers who do not provide the evaluation 15 days prior to the scheduled meeting (extraordinary circumstances honored) will not be paid for the evaluation. Adherence to these letters will be monitored in the early spring of 2010.

The CDS State IEU will address the areas of non-compliance for indicator C7 in indicator C9.

In addition to the activities documented for FFY2009 , the following activities continue:

- Weekly webinars with individuals who routinely enter and use the Case-e data system. These webinars are interactive and provide an opportunity for clarifying conversations between regional site personnel and the CDS State IEU Data Manager.
- Compliance timelines are continually discussed and stressed to all CDS personnel and contract providers by all CDS State IEU personnel, CDS State IEU contracted individuals who provide regional site training, and by the Regional Site Directors.
- The CDS State IEU continues to contract with two individuals to provide training to regional sites in the areas determined by the CDS State IEU Director as a result of Letters of Findings, data system reviews, as well as queries and requests from the field.
- CDS State IEU continuing use of, and reference to, Part C Process Chart for employee use http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/program_overview_2009.pdf
- The CDS State IEU continues to provide Lunch and Learn sessions to CDS personnel. These continue to be a proven method of outreach and training to staff throughout the state. The Lunch and Learn sessions are used to provide clarifying information on a variety of issues that have been discovered through monitoring, through requests from the field and/or consultants and based on information provided to the CDS State IEU. A major focus of the Lunch and Learn sessions are on the clarification, practice and understand of the Part C Federal and State Regulations. As we move into the next fiscal year the Lunch and Learn sessions will expand to discuss best practices and strategies to meet indicator and MUSER requirements. The success of the Lunch and Learn sessions was shared by the Director at the 2009 Leadership conference.
- For FFY2009, the CDS State IEU is utilizing ARRA funds to support the work of a contracted individual who is working at each local site regarding indicator 12. This individual addresses the data from each site's Letter of Findings and provides

training based on each sites specific needs. In addition to the B12 training the CDS State IEU will continue monitoring each site showing noncompliance through desk audits, focused monitoring and on site review.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

No revisions.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100 = $[(\#)/(\#)] * 100 = \#$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
2008	100% of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
2008	Not required to be reported for FFY2008

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

N/A

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

N/A

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measurement:

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100 = \text{[(not reported)]}$

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100 = \text{[(not reported)]}$

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100 = \text{[(not reported)]}$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
2008	<i>85% of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and are competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school</i>
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
2008	Not required to be reported for FFY2008

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

Data on post-school outcomes are not required to be reported for this year.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

Targets for the new measurement will be established using analysis of disaggregated student survey data collect in this and previous years. Those new targets will be developed in concert with others requiring revision this year due to measurement changes. New targets will be included in the SPP by July of 2010.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects non-compliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Measurement:

Percent of non-compliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of non-compliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Target data for FFY 2008 – the percent shown in the last row of the Indicator 15 Worksheet [column (b) sum divided by column (a)] sum times 100

(Indicator 15 Worksheet included within the text of this indicator below)

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
2008	100% non-compliance corrected within one year of identification
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
2008	93% non-compliance corrected within one year of identification

Extract from Annual Performance Report (APR) Letter to Maine's Commissioner of Education Dated June 1, 2009: (concerning Indicators 15 and 20)

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising the State of available sources of technical assistance related to Indicators 15 (timely correction) and 20 (timely and accurate data). A list of sources of technical assistance related to the SPP/APR indicators is available by clicking on the "Technical Assistance Related to Determinations" box on the opening page of the SPP/APR Planning Calendar website at <http://spp-apr-calendar.rfcnetwork.org/techassistance.html>. You will be directed to a list of indicators. Click on specific indicators for a list of centers, documents, web seminars and other sources of relevant technical assistance for that indicator. For the indicators listed above, your State must: (1) report with its FFY 2008 APR submission, due February 1, 2010, on: (a) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (b) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance; and (2) report to OSEP by October 1, 2009 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance [and/or lack of valid and reliable data].

Maine's response:

(1) (a) Child Development Services and the Maine Department of Education have received assistance from National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), RMC Research Corporation (RMC), the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), the New England Regional Resource Center (NERRC), The Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center, the ECO Conference, the OSEP Overlapping IDEA Part B and Part C Data Meetings, the OSEP Leadership Conference, Data Accountability Center (DAC) National Advisory Board and Annual Meeting, and the National Early Childhood Transition Initiative. The technical assistance used has been through webinars, conference calls, websites, and provided materials. We have also had the opportunity to provide training to other states on our General Supervision System as well as our work with Child Outcomes. (b) The technical assistance has guided changes and adaptations to our General Supervision System which incorporates all indicators and monitoring for compliance. The knowledge and strategies gained thus far have initiated policy and practice changes to meet compliance.

(2) A report was provided to OSEP on October 1, 2009.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

Note: These data are regarding correction of findings of non-compliance the State made during FFY 2007 (July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008).

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Non-compliance Timely Corrected (corrected within one year from identification of the non-compliance):

Number of findings of non-compliance the State made during FFY 2007 (the period from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	255
Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	237
Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	18

Correction of FFY 2007 Findings of Non-compliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the non-compliance):

Number of FFY 2007 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	18
Number of findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	3
Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	15

Part B- 619

Maine's Child Development Services system was tasked with significant restructuring in FFY2005. The infrastructure changes that have occurred support continuity in the areas of policy, human resources, data management, and fiscal oversight. In addition to the infrastructure that is in place, The CDS State IEU oversees Indicator Improvement and the General Supervision System.

In FY2006, the CDS State IEU Director recognized that the restructuring required the development of a General Supervision System needed to be established with all aspects of monitoring the work of the regional sites included within the structure of one overall system.

In FY2007, the CDS State IEU, with technical assistance from NERRC, developed a pilot birth to five General Supervision System that references and builds upon the general supervision system "Big 8" developed by OSEP(http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/supervision/gsst_509.ppt). The system includes our monitoring component. The system established a mechanism to define the requirements of general supervision, an annual performance determination for each regional site on the Part B indicators, a self assessment process for each site, and the structure and support available from the CDS State IEU. The regional sites, regional boards, CDS State Level Advisory Board and the State Advisory Council have supported the system. The CDS State IEU Director and Birth to Five Intervention, Program and Staff Development consultant have provided numerous trainings and technical assistance to the above groups and individuals over the last year.

The CDS State IEU developed, organized, and provided the system components and all accompanying documents for utilization as of July 1, 2009. Over the last several months the CDS State IEU has worked with members of the K-20 Special Services Team to merge the Birth to Five GSST with the former 5 to 20 CIMP (Continues Improvement and Monitoring Program) process. The Birth to 20 GSST was presented for the first time at the 2009 MADSEC Fall Conference to Special Education Administrators and CDS Regional Directors from throughout the state. Implementation of the Birth to 20 system will begin in late winter of 2010. A drafted Birth to 20 Administrative Letter from the Commissioner of Education is awaiting approval to be sent out to all who are involved in the system in the very near future. The CDS website has a General Supervision System link as a resource to all stakeholders. Any information or resource materials will be posted on the CDS and Maine Department of Education Special Services website. Lunch and Learn training sessions are scheduled for January 29, 2010 and February 12, 2010 for all Birth to 20 site directors and administrators and a webinar is scheduled in February 2010 to address a revised three to 20 Child Record Audit Form.

(<http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/supervision/documents/CRAF.doc>)

The CDS State IEU monitored each of the regional sites annually over a two year period from the Spring of 2007 until the Summer of 2009. All sites received a Year One Letter of Findings, followed by a Year Two Letter of Findings indicating corrections of identified non-compliance as of June 30, 2009. All letters of findings are located at:

<http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/monitoring/index.html>.

PART B INDICATOR 15 WORKSHEET (next three pages)

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of non-compliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of non-compliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	31	31	31
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.				
14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.				
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
4A. Percent of LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	46	46	46
6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.				
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	9	9	9

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of non-compliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of non-compliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
9. Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification. 10. Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	14	14	5
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	4	4	4
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of non-compliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of non-compliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
Other areas of non-compliance:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Other areas of non-compliance: Findings of non-compliance related to implementation of Maine's Unified Special Education Regulation	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	16	151	142
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Other areas of non-compliance:	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			255	237
Percent of non-compliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			(b) / (a) X 100 =	92.94

In addition, Letters of Findings were issued in June of 2009 to each regional site based upon a focused monitoring for B11 compliance requirements and a corrective action plan was outlined for areas of non-compliance identified in 2007 and not corrected within one year of identification. A sample letter can be found at:

<http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/monitoring/documents/sampleletterfindings.doc>

The in-depth on-site monitoring which was undertaken over the past two years at each site provided an in depth focus on the performance of each site. Utilizing the data gathered over the two years, the CDS State IEU was well positioned to start the response to determination portion of the GSST system on July 1, 2009. Each site was instructed regarding their individual

response required by the system based on their specific determination level for each indicator. Effective July 1, 2009, all CDS regional sites are required to complete a self assessment and identify areas of improvement needed in addition to any outstanding work required to complete their corrective action plans based on their Letters of Findings. Over the course of FFY2008, The CDS State Level Advisory Board reviewed SPP indicators at each meeting. This provided assurance regarding knowledge at the management level to support each site in their efforts to reach targets and to complete their self assessment and improvement plans. There is clarity on the part of all that non-compliance is not acceptable and that the B-20 GSST is designed to identify issues and to assist with and oversee local work towards improvement on any profile indicator determinations 2, 3, or 4 as addressed through the response to determination portion of the [CDS GSST](http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/spp/index.html). This will involve self assessment, internal monitoring, and increasing levels of interaction between the site and the CDS State IEU (<http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/spp/index.html>).

The CDS State IEU has proposed an organizational restructuring. The reorganization will afford a savings to the system which is requisite given the budget cuts the Department of Education has sustained for FFY2011. The reorganization effort, achieved by a group of local site board members and local CDS directors, has approached the system changes from both a fiscal and programmatic view. The draft proposal which has been presented to the Education committee of the legislature, the State Level Advisory Board, and MACECD, the state's oversight committee for IDEA, supports a creative use of personnel in the system to support the work of the local regional sites and to serve as bridges to the systems growth on OSEP indicators within the GSST. (<http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/supervision/documents/CDSSystemProposedRestructure.pdf>)

Actions Taken for Non-compliance Not Corrected

For FFY 2007 findings remaining open, the following activities continue:

- Weekly webinars with individuals who routinely enter and use the Case-e data system. These webinars are interactive and provide an opportunity for clarifying conversations between regional site personnel and the CDS State IEU Data Manager.
- Compliance timelines are continually discussed and stressed to all CDS personnel and contract providers by all CDS State IEU personnel, CDS State IEU contracted individuals who provide regional site training, and by the Regional Site Directors.
- The CDS State IEU continues to contract with two individuals to provide training to regional sites in the areas determined by the CDS State IEU Director as a result of Letters of Findings, data system reviews, as well as queries and requests from the field.
- CDS State IEU continuing use of, and reference to, Part C Process Chart for employee use http://www.maine.gov/education/speced/cds/program_overview_2009.pdf
- The CDS State IEU continues to provide Lunch and Learn sessions to CDS personnel. These continue to be a proven method of outreach and training to staff throughout the state. The Lunch and Learn sessions are used to provide clarifying information on

a variety of issues that have been discovered through monitoring, through requests from the field and/or consultants and based on information provided to the CDS State IEU. A major focus of the Lunch and Learn sessions are on the clarification, practice and understand of the Part C Federal and State Regulations. As we move into the next fiscal year the Lunch and Learn sessions will expand to discuss best practices and strategies to meet indicator and MUSER requirements. The success of the Lunch and Learn sessions was shared by the Director at the 2009 Leadership conference.

- For FFY2009, the CDS State IEU is utilizing ARRA funds to support the work of a contracted individual who is working at each local site regarding indicator 12. This individual addresses the data from each site's Letter of Findings and provides training based on each sites specific needs. In addition to the B12 training the CDS State IEU will continue monitoring each site showing noncompliance through desk audits, focused monitoring and on site review.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

No revisions.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

Measurement:

Table 7 data, section A

SECTION A: WRITTEN, SIGNED COMPLAINTS	
(1) Total number of written, signed complaints filed	48
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	14
(a) Reports with findings of non-compliance	8
(b) Reports within timeline	8
(c) Reports within extended timelines	6
(1.2) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaints pending a due process hearing	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	34

Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100 = [(8+6)/14]*100 = 100

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
2008	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
2008	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

No changes.

This measure met the target. 100 percent of signed written complaints with reports issued were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint. Eight of the 14 complaints with reports issued were resolved within timelines without extension. Cases extended due to exceptional circumstances met the guidelines provided by the Due Process Office (DPO) for consideration of requests for extension.

As had been planned in the SPP, the DPO and the stakeholder group review cases monthly for closure timelines and consideration of support requirements. The SPP stakeholder group reviews case summaries and outcomes with members of the DPO to discuss procedural safeguards, support requirements, and opportunities for systemic improvement. The summaries are also posted on our website (<http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/dueprocess/2009Complaints.html>) in redacted form for parents and others in the public to review (note: 16 cases are summarized on the website; 14 are Part B cases, but 09.020C and 09.086C are Part C cases). Data reports of case progress and follow-up actions are produced interactively by DPO personnel using the case management database for use in their daily activities and in their presentations to stakeholder and interested parties. All of these activities have combined to heighten awareness of the timeline requirement and have improved case management through appropriate visibility and review.

The due process website has been significantly upgraded this year to provide a number of new documents and technical assistance to the public. Complaint investigation reports, procedures, policies and forms are available electronically on the due process website: <http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/dueprocess/index.htm>

During FFY2007, Maine reported 9 complaint investigations with findings. Each of the corrective actions was tracked in a database and followed to completion with DPO overseeing the responsible LEAs completion. Each of the findings was corrected within the required 12 months and the closures have been reporting among the findings corrected in indicator 15 of this report.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

No revisions.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

Measurement:

Table 7 data, section C

SECTION C: DUE PROCESS COMPLAINTS	
(3) Total number of due process complaints filed	26
(3.1) Resolution meetings	4
(a) Written settlement agreements	2
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated	5
(a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited)	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	5
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	17

Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100 = [(0+5)/5]*100 = 100

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
2008	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
2008	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that was properly extended by the hearing officer.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

This measure met the target. 100 percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. The DPO and the stakeholder group review case status and progress monthly to ensure timeline compliance.

The due process website has been significantly upgraded this year to provide a number of new documents and technical assistance to the public. Hearing reports, policies and forms are available electronically on the due process website:

<http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/dueprocess/index.htm>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

No revisions.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

Measurement:

Table 7 data, section C

SECTION C: DUE PROCESS COMPLAINTS	
(3) Total number of due process complaints filed	26
(3.1) Resolution meetings	4
(a) Written settlement agreements	2
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated	5
(a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited)	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	5
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	17

Percent = [(3.1(a) divided by 3.1)] times 100 = [(2/4)]*100 = 50

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
2008	40% of resolution sessions will result in settlement agreements.
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
2008	50% of resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

This measure exceeded the target.

The DPO produced “Resolution Sessions, A Guide for Parents and Educators” to help parents and educators better understand the resolution session as one of the ways to resolve special education disputes. The handbook will be provided to individuals requesting a due process hearing.

The due process website has been significantly upgraded this year to provide a number of new documents and technical assistance to the public. The resolution session document and forms are available electronically on the due process website:

<http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/dueprocess/index.htm>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

No revisions.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

Measurement:

Table 7 data, section B

SECTION B: MEDIATION REQUESTS	
(2) Total number of mediation requests received	98
(2.1) Mediations held	43
(a) Mediations held related to due process complaints	5
(i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	4
(b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints	38
(i) Mediation agreements not related to due process	33
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	55

Percent = $[(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } 2.1] \text{ times } 100 = [(4+33)/43] * 100 = 86$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
2008	80% of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
2008	86% of mediations held resulted in mediation agreements.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

This measure exceeded the target.

When a dispute resolution request is received for a complaint investigation, hearing or expedited hearing, and the initiating party has indicated an unwillingness to participate in mediation, DPO staff follow up with the initiating party to discuss the benefits of mediation. Information is provided on: the difference between mediation and an IEP meeting; the expertise, knowledge and objectivity of the mediators on the DPO roster; the wide scope of issues that can be mediated; and the constructive/positive effect participation in mediation can have on the communication between the parties.

The due process website has been significantly upgraded this year to provide a number of new documents and technical assistance to the public. The mediation handbook is available electronically on the due process website:

<http://www.state.me.us/education/speced/dueprocess/index.htm>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

No revisions.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

Measurement: See Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY2008
<i>2008</i>	<i>100% of data submitted will be on time and accurate.</i>
FFY	Actual Target Data for FFY2008
<i>2008</i>	<i>95.3% of data submitted on time and accurate.</i>

Extract from Annual Performance Report (APR) Letter to Maine's Commissioner of Education Dated June 1, 2009: (concerning Indicators 15 and 20)

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising the State of available sources of technical assistance related to Indicators 15 (timely correction) and 20 (timely and accurate data). A list of sources of technical assistance related to the SPP/APR indicators is available by clicking on the "Technical Assistance Related to Determinations" box on the opening page of the SPP/APR Planning Calendar website at <http://spp-apr-calendar.rrfnetwork.org/techassistance.html>. You will be directed to a list of indicators. Click on specific indicators for a list of centers, documents, web seminars and other sources of relevant technical assistance for that indicator. For the indicators listed above, your State must: (1) report with its FFY 2008 APR submission, due February 1, 2010, on: (a) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (b) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance; and (2) report to OSEP by October 1, 2009 how the technical assistance selected by the State is addressing the factors contributing to the ongoing noncompliance [and/or lack of valid and reliable data].

Maine's response:

(1) Maine Department of Education resources have engaged technical assistance from New England Regional Resource Center (NERRC), the OSEP Overlapping IDEA Part B and Part C Data Meetings, RMC Research Corporation (RMC), the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), and the OSEP Leadership Conference. Additionally, Maine made contact with Jane Nell Luster

to determine the need for Data Accountability Center (DAC) customized technical assistance. Maine's Part C/Section 619 Coordinator is a member of the DAC national advisory board. On a monthly basis, Maine engage in conference calls with Part C and Part B OSEP state contacts.

(b) The technical assistance Maine has received is guiding changes to data validation and quality assurance procedures pertaining to 618 data and EDFacts data submissions. Improvements in internal controls will result in complete data submissions that pass DAC edit checks.

(2) A report was provided to OSEP on October 1, 2009.

Part B Indicator 20 Data Rubric

Part B Indicator 20 - SPP/APR Data			
APR Indicator	Valid and reliable	Correct calculation	Total
1	1		1
2	1		1
3A	1	1	2
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
14	1	1	2
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		Subtotal	38
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points (5 pts for submission of APR/SPP by February 2, 2009)		5
	Grand Total		43

Part B Indicator 20 - 618 Data					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/1/08	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 – Personnel Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3 – Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/08	1	1	1	1	4
Table 4 – Exiting Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 5 – Discipline Due Date: 11/1/08	1	0	1	N/A	2
Table 6 – State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/09	1	1	0	N/A	2
Table 7 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/08	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	21
			Weighted Total (subtotal X 1.87; round ≤.49 down and ≥ .50 up to whole number)		39
Indicator #20 Calculation					
			A. APR Total	43	43
			B. 618 Total	43	39
			C. Grand Total	86	82
Percent of timely and accurate data = (C divided by 86 times 100)			(C) / (86) X 100 =		95.3

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2008:

Maine is submitting most of its 618 data via EDFacts, but continues to submit Table 5, Table 6 and Table 7 using the Data Accountability Center DTS workbooks. Data validation procedure has been expanded to perform a double-check of the EDFacts data by entering the data into the DTS formats to ensure compatibility. Reports have been developed to permit review of year-to-year changes in data in anticipation of clarification request or to highlight where data notes may be necessary. These steps have improved data quality and have prepared the State to resolve data issues before the data are submitted.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2008:

No revisions.